



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/671,168	09/25/2003	Mordechai Lev	HOME 0682 PUS	7012
22045	7590	12/22/2005	EXAMINER	
BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C. 1000 TOWN CENTER TWENTY-SECOND FLOOR SOUTHFIELD, MI 48075			AMARI, ALESSANDRO V	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2872	

DATE MAILED: 12/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/671,168

Applicant(s)

LEV ET AL.

Examiner

Alessandro V. Amari

Art Unit

2872

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-55 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-40 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 41-55 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 41, 42, 44, 46 and 48-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zadro US 6,305,809 in view of Gorischek US 2002/0196333.

In regard to claim 41, Zadro teaches (see Figures 1-3) a double sided cosmetic mirror comprising a housing (14) with a first end opening and a second end opening; a first substrate (12) having a first peripheral edge, a first front surface and an opposed first rear surface, the first peripheral edge being affixed within the first opening of the housing as described in column 4, lines 54-63; a first reflective coating (13) provided on one of first front and the first rear surfaces, the first reflective coating causing the first substrate to be reflective when viewed by a user from the first surface side as shown in Figures 1-2; a second substrate having a curvature substantially different from the first substrate (15), the second substrate having a second peripheral edge, a second front surface, and an opposed second rear surface, the second peripheral edge being affixed within the second opening of the housing as described in column 4, lines 64-68 and column 5, lines 1-5; a second reflective coating (16) provided on one of the second front and the second rear surfaces, the second reflective coating causing the second substrate to be reflective when viewed by the user from the second front surface side as

shown in Figure 3. Regarding claim 44, Zadro teaches (see Figures 1-3) a support base (18) and a pivot axle (23) mounted to the support base and pivotably attached to the housing for rotating the housing about the pivot axle and thereby allowing the user to rotate the housing about the pivot axle to view the first front surface and the second front surface as described in column 5, lines 15-20.

However, in regard to claim 41, Zadro does not teach a first information display oriented the first substrate for being viewable by a user; a second information display oriented the second substrate for being viewable by the user; an information source circuit connected to and controlling both the first and second information displays; and at least one user selectable switch cooperating with the information source circuit for controlling the first and second information displays.

In regard to claim 41, Gorischek does teach (see Figure 2C, 3) information display (16) for use in mirrors being viewable by the user, an information source circuit controlling said displays as shown in Figure 3 and at least one user selectable switch (60) cooperating with the information source circuit for controlling the displays.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the display, information source circuit and switch as taught by Gorischek in each of the substrates in the mirror of Zadro in order to readily provide information about the ambient environment (e.g., time, temperature) or other information to the user in order to increase convenience.

Regarding claim 42, Gorischek teaches (see Figure 2C) further comprising at least one light source (90) received by a housing and at least one user selectable switch (62) controlling at least one light source for selective operation thereof.

Regarding claim 46, Gorischek teaches (see Figure 2C) that the substrates are provided with at least one touch sensor (60) cooperating with at least one user selectable switch (35) as described in page 4, paragraph 0044.

Regarding claims 48-51, Gorischek teaches (see Figure 2C) non-reflective portions being openings (50) in the substrate or substrate windows (50) wherein the non-reflective portions cooperates with the information display as described in page 2, paragraph 0044.

3. Claims 43, 52, 53 and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zadro US 6,305,809 in view of Gorischek US 2002/0196333 and further in view of Corinaldi US 3,377,474.

Regarding claims 43, 52, 53 and 55, Zadro in view of Gorischek teaches the invention as set forth above and regarding claim 53, Gorischek teaches (see Figure 2C) light sources (90) providing a plurality of lighting modes including a night light setting as described in page 3, paragraph 0030 and in regard to claim 55, Gorischek teaches (see Figure 2C) a non-reflective portion with a switch controlling the at least one first light source and an information display as described on page 2, paragraph 0026 and page 3, paragraphs 0030 and 0032.

However, regarding claim 43, Zadro in view of Gorischek does not teach at least one first light source mounted on first substrate, at least one second light source

Art Unit: 2872

mounted on second substrate and the at least one switch controlling the at least one first light source and at least one second light source for selective operation thereof and in regard to claim 52, does not teach that the first non reflective portion cooperates with a first light source and a second non-reflective portion cooperates with a second light source.

Regarding claim 43, Corinaldi teaches (see Figures 1-5) a light source (3) mounted on a substrate and at least one switch (4, 5, 6) controlling the light source for selective operation thereof as described in column 2, lines 6-19. Regarding claim 52, Corinaldi teaches (see Figures 1-5) that a non reflective portion (9, 10) cooperates with a light source (3) as described in column 2, lines 24-31.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the light source and switch as taught by Corinaldi in the mirror of Zadro in view of Gorischek in order to provide better illumination for the user.

4. Claim 54 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zadro US 6,305,809 in view of Gorischek US 2002/0196333 in view of Corinaldi US 3,377,474 and further in view of Guerrieri US 6,848,807.

Regarding claim 54, Zadro in view of Gorischek and further in view of Corinaldi teaches the invention as set forth above but does not teach that the light source includes an automatic shut off feature.

Regarding claim 54, Guerrieri teaches that a light source includes an automatic shut off feature as described in column 4, lines 10-21.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the automatic shut off feature as taught by Guerrieri in the mirror of Zadro in view of Gorischek and further in view of Corinaldi in order that power need not be wasted or that battery power be needlessly depleted.

5. Claim 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zadro US 6,305,809 in view of Gorischek US 2002/0196333 and further in view of Broussard US 6,149,277.

Regarding claim 45, Zadro in view of Gorischek teaches the invention as set forth above but does not teach that the information source circuit is a clock circuit.

Regarding claim 45, Broussard teaches (see Figure 1) that the information source circuit is a clock circuit (30) as described in column 3, lines 4-8.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the clock circuit of Broussard in the mirror of Zadro in view of Gorischek in order to readily provide time information to the user and thus increase user's convenience.

6. Claim 47 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zadro US 6,305,809 in view of Gorischek US 2002/0196333 and further in view of Hourmand US 5,796,183.

Regarding claim 47, Zadro in view of Gorischek teaches the invention as set forth above but does not teach in regard to claim 47, that the at least one user selectable switch is a capacitive switching circuit button.

Regarding claim 47, Hourmand teaches that the at least one user selectable switch is a capacitive switching circuit button as described in column 11, lines 60-67 and column 12, lines 1-49.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the capacitive switching circuit button as taught by Hourmand in the mirror of Zadro in view of Gorischek in order to provide for a switch that is less susceptible to wear and fatigue.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 41-55 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alessandro V. Amari whose telephone number is (571) 272-2306. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Drew Dunn can be reached on (571) 272-2312. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2872

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ava/AV
20 December 2005

Alessandro Amari
Alessandro Amari
Examiner AU2872